



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*W*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,913	10/06/2003	James Ronald Lawter	05-760-A	2961
20306 7590 11/16/2007 MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER JAGOE, DONNA A	
			ART UNIT 1614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/679,913

Applicant(s)

LAWTER, JAMES RONALD

Examiner

Donna Jagoe

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 18-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 18-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

***Claims 1 and 18-30 are pending in this application.***

Applicants' arguments filed July 18, 2007 have been fully considered and they are deemed to be persuasive regarding previous rejections of record. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

However, upon reconsideration, the following rejections and/or objections are newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1614

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orapharma Inc. WO 01/19362 A2 in view of Acharya U.S. Patent No. 5,686,094. Orapharma Inc. teaches a composition for treatment of the oral mucosa comprising tetracycline (page 5, line 17 to page 6, line 25) and a mucoadhesive polymer (page 7, line 15 to page 9, line 15), and a buffer (page 8, lines 11-32) buffered to a pH of 3.5 to 8, which partially overlaps the claimed pH of 6.5 to 9. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare additional useful compositions of the ranges taught by the prior art. While the reference is silent regarding the pH above 8 to 9, the difference in pH will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. When the general conditions are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 45, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In the absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results of the additional ranges claimed, the instant invention is considered obvious. Suitable solid dosage forms are recited (page 10, lines 1-9).

Meclocycline sulfosalicylate salt, the penultimate species is exemplified in Examples 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13 (pages 12-15), to treat oral mucositis. Methods are provided to treat oral mucositis from radiation or chemotherapy for cancer (see page 1) comprising an effective amount of a tetracycline and a mucoadhesive polymer carrier (page 7, line 15 to page 9, line 15). The mucoadhesive polymer, gelatin, is not specifically recited.

Art Unit: 1614

However, Acharya teaches a polymeric delivery system comprising a bioadhesive agent (see column 1, lines 55-65) comprising gelatin (column 5, lines 20-37). It is prima facie obvious to substitute equivalents, motivated by the reasonable expectation that the respective species will behave in a comparable manner or give comparable results in comparable circumstances. *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343; *In re Jezel* 158 USPQ 99; the express suggestion to substitute one equivalent for another need not be present to render the substitution obvious. *In re Font*, 213 USPQ 532. It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to substitute the natural polymer, gelatin as disclosed in Acharya, for the natural polymers carageenan and pectin as disclosed in Orapharma Inc motivated by the need for a polymer carrier that is safe and effective in forming a film on the mucosal surfaces. Regarding the "sugar" in independent claims 1 and 27, Orapharma teaches the addition of "natural and artificial sweeteners" (page 9, lines 16-18). Acharya teaches that mannitol and lactose are included in oral composition as simple or complex carbohydrates (column 5, lines 63-67) and as excipients (column 6, lines 48-61). It would have been prima facie obvious to substitute one sugar for the other. Express suggestion to substitute one equivalent for another need not be present to render such substitution obvious.

Orapharma Inc. teach the inclusion of natural and artificial sugars. Acharya teaches the inclusion of mannitol and lactose as simple or complex carbohydrates and as excipients. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the natural sugars taught in Orapharma Inc for the simple and complex

Art Unit: 1614

carbohydrates of Acharya for the predictable result of sweetening a lozenge or saliva substitute for treatment of oral mucositis.

Regarding the liquid formulations of new claims 27-30, they are recited in the Orapharma disclosure on page 9, lines 4-15.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 18-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of copending Application No. 11/230397. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant and conflicting

Art Unit: 1614

claims recite substantially the same subject matter, differing only in the description of the particular components claimed. For instance, conflicting claims 1-8 recite the structure of the tetracycline compositions that are encompassed by the broad claim "a tetracycline" in the instant claims. Further, the methods of conflicting claims 15-24 recite substantially the same subject matter, the method of treating or preventing oral mucositis resulting from radiation or chemotherapy for cancer comprising administering a tetracycline in a topical carrier. It would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art that the claims overlapped in scope in this manner. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have interpreted the claims as broadly as is reasonable, and in doing so recognize that they are coextensive in scope and thus the proper subject of an obviousness-type double patenting rejection as outlined by *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 18 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,683,067. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant and conflicting claims recite substantially the same subject matter, differing only in the description of the particular components claimed. For instance, conflicting claim 1 requires a method of treating mucositis comprising administering a poorly absorbed tetracycline in a carrier for topical. Instant claim 18 is broadly inclusive thereof in that it recites tetracycline sulfosalicylate salt for oral mucositis from radiation or chemotherapy of cancer. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 1614

anyone of ordinary skill in the art that the claims overlapped in scope in this manner.

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have interpreted the claims as broadly as is reasonable, and in doing so recognize that they are coextensive in scope and thus the proper subject of an obviousness-type double patenting rejection as outlined by *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

Claims 1-and 18-30 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,893,665. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant and conflicting claims recite substantially the same subject matter, differing only in the description of the particular components claimed. For instance, conflicting claim 1 requires a composition comprising a tetracycline in the form of a polyvalent metal ion complex. Instant claim 1 is broadly inclusive thereof in that it recites a tetracycline sulfosalicylate salt. The instant claims differ from the reference in claiming a broader scope. It would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art that the claims overlapped in scope in this manner. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have interpreted the claims as broadly as is reasonable, and in doing so recognize that they are coextensive in scope and thus the proper subject of an obviousness-type double patenting rejection as outlined by *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

Claims 1 and 19-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,946,118. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from



Art Unit: 1614

each other because the instant and conflicting claims recite substantially the same subject matter, differing only in the description of the particular components claimed. For instance, conflicting claim 1 requires a composition comprising a poorly absorbed tetracycline. Instant claim 1 is broadly inclusive thereof in that it recites a tetracycline. The instant claims differ from the reference in claiming a broader scope. It would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art that the claims overlapped in scope in this manner. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have interpreted the claims as broadly as is reasonable, and in doing so recognize that they are coextensive in scope and thus the proper subject of an obviousness-type double patenting rejection as outlined by *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1614

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Donna Jagoe  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1614

November 5, 2007



**ARDIN H. MARSCHEL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**